

### **PREVIOUS REMARKS**

Claims 2-10, 16-18 and 20 are pending in this application. Claims 2, 16-18, and 20 are amended. Claims 1, 11-15 and 19 have been canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the underlying subject matter.

Applicants thank Examiner Hoang and Examiner Nguyen for the courtesy of the personal interview with Applicants' representative on March 9, 2006 ("the interview"). During the interview, Applicants' representative described the differences between the claimed invention and U.S. Patent No. 6,366,954 to Traversat et al. For example, Applicants' representative pointed out that the applied art does not disclose or suggest, among other features, "populating the LDAP attributes with the one or more persistent attribute values," as recited in independent claims 2, 16 and 20. In addition, during the interview, Applicants' representative proposed clarifying amendments to the claims in order to further prosecution in this matter. The clarifying amendments are presented herein. The Examiners agreed that Applicants' arguments and clarifying amendments would be considered in the next Office Action.

In view of the foregoing amendments and following remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw all outstanding grounds of rejection. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the application.

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, claims 2-10, and 16-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Although Applicants believe that the claims, as previously presented, are directed to statutory subject matter, Applicants have amended independent claims 2 and 16-18, as requested by the Examiner. Claim 2 now reads a "[a] computer implemented method..." and claims 16-18 now read "[a] computer readable storage medium...". Applicants submit that the claim rejection under § 101 have been overcome.

Claims 2, 3-9, 16, 17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. 6,366,954 to Traversat et al. (hereafter, *Traversat*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,305,007 to Mintz (hereafter, *Mintz*). Claims 10 and 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being rendered obvious over *Traversat* in view of *Mintz* and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,240,422 to Atkins et al. (hereafter, *Atkins*).

Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP 2143.03 (emphasis added).

The applied references, applied separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all the claim limitations.

As discussed during the interview, *Traversat* does not disclose or suggest, at least, “determining a path from information in the object, wherein the path identifies a location in the LDAP repository to store the object and the path identifies a LDAP object that corresponds to the object,” as recited, among other features, in independent claims 2, 16 and 20. Support for these claim elements can be found in the specification at, e.g., page 14, lines 24-29. The cited sections of *Traversat* including col. 5, lines 55-60, and col. 6, lines 13-18 do not teach or suggest these claimed features. Therefore, independent claims 2, 16 and 20 are in condition for allowance over the applied art for at least these features. The applied references including *Mintz*, *Atkins* and *Helgeson* fail to overcome those deficiencies of *Traversat* with respect to independent claims 2, 16 and 20 described above.

In addition, the applied references, applied separately or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest, “storing the object in the LDAP repository,” as claimed. Specifically, the applied reference(s) do not disclose or suggest one or more of the following features:

- mapping the persistent attributes to LDAP attributes, wherein the LDAP attributes are associated with the LDAP object identified by the determined path;

- populating the LDAP attributes with the one or more persistent attribute values; and

- passing the LDAP attributes populated with the one or more persistent attribute values to the LDAP repository,

as recited, among other features, in independent claims 2, 16 and 20. The Office Action at page 5 states that *Traversat*, at col. 12, lines 42-45, discloses “LDAP entry is mapped to a JSD entry.” However, *Traversat* does not disclose or suggest “mapping the persistent attributes to LDAP attributes,” as claimed. Mapping LDAP entry to a JSD (Java System Database) entry, as in *Traversat* is not the same as mapping the persistent attributes to LDAP attributes, as claimed. Moreover, *Traversat* does not disclose or suggest that LDAP attributes are associated with the LDAP object identified by the determined path, as claimed. Therefore, independent claims 2, 16 and 20 are in condition for allowance over the applied art for these additional reasons.

As noted in MPEP 2143.03, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. It is respectfully requested that the Office Action provides specific support in the cited references for each and every claim limitation, or the respective claim be allowed.

For at least the above-stated reasons, independent claims 2, 16 and 20 are in condition for allowance over the applied art.

Claims 3-10 depend from independent claim 2 and claims 17-18 depend from independent claim 16. Therefore, claims 3-10 and 17-18 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above and for the independently patentable features they recite.


### CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants believe that all of the objections and rejections against this application have been fully addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. Therefore, withdrawal of the outstanding objections and rejections and a notice of allowance for the application are respectfully requested.

It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's deposit account no. 08-2025.

If the Examiner believes that a personal or telephonic interview would be of value in expediting the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned counsel to arrange for such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: March 13, 2006

Sean Wooden  
Reg. No. 43,997  
**ANDREWS & KURTH LLP**  
1350 I Street, NW  
Suite 1100  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 662-2738  
Fax: (202) 662-2739